

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

CHAPTER XIX

Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles

Bo Reicke

Translated by Manfred Kwiran and W. Ward Gasque

[p.277]

Students of the history of the New Testament literature should not assume *a priori* that Paul's imprisonment presupposed by Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, and Phiippians refers to the same location. When the Book of Acts reports an imprisonment in Caesarea (ca. A.D. 58-60) and in Rome (ca. 60-62), the possibility that Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians — whether "genuine" or not — may presuppose one location, and Philippians a different one, must be considered.

In point of fact, references contained in the two groups of letters which convey information concerning the sender and recipients are quite different. The assumption that we are here dealing with two different situations is, therefore, not unwarranted.

I

Certainly, as far as personalia are concerned, Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians¹ form a group by themselves. The popular question concerning the Pauline or non-Pauline origin and contents of Colossians and Ephesians in no way influences this factor. We have as a starting-point the "genuineness" of Philemon, a fact which is recognized by contemporary scholarship in general. Whether Colossians and Ephesians are regarded as having been written by Paul or are believed to be forgeries, it is in any case necessary to find out what these related epistles tell us about the situation of the apostle, his fellow workers, and the correspondents. It is also noteworthy that Philemon and Colossians show no literary dependence on one another, and yet they contain similar personal references. Greetings are sent from practically the same people (Phm. 23; Col. 1:7; 4:12-19), and they were to be delivered (evidently at the same time) to the recipients by one Tychicus, who is accompanied by Onesimus (Phm. 2, 12; Col. 4:7-9). Ephesians, which is closely related to Colossians (regardless of the question whether it was written by Paul or by one of his disciples), also assumes that Tychicus was to bring this epistle (Eph. 6:21 ff.) to his fellow countrymen

[p.278]

in the province of Asia (Acts 20:4). Since this Tychicus can be assumed to be an Ephesian (after the analogy of his companion, Trophimus, in Acts 21:29), the readers who know him are to be sought first in Ephesus (so Eph. 1:1, majority reading). These references concerning the situation of the epistles, even if the situation was for some unknown reason invented,

¹ See literature cited in W. G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (Heidelberg, 1963), pp. 241-64, 409 f., 412 [= ET, pp. 237-58, 389 f., 397].

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

indicate that Tychicus first came to the Lycus River valley with the letters to Philemon and the Colossians and then went on to Ephesus through the Meander valley with the Ephesian letter (cf. 2 Tim. 4:12); or, alternatively, one could imagine the same route in reverse, depending on whether the letters originated in Caesarea or in Rome. At any rate, one has here a natural, uniform and straightforward description of the situation. Furthermore, the personal as well as the topographical circumstances clearly bind the three letters together; even on the assumption that Colossians and Ephesians are spurious, it would be necessary to take notice of the description of the situation.

On the other hand, Philippians² stands by itself. The only thing this epistle has in common with the others is the cooperation of Timothy (Phm. 1; Col. 1:1; Phil. 1:1). All the rest of the personalia are different. Epaphras and Epaphroditus are not to be identified: the former is in Colossae, while the latter is at home in Philippi. The suggestion that the prison epistles of Asia Minor and the epistle to the Philippians could have been dispatched in connexion with one another is made difficult by the geographical situation. In fact, however, there is no reason to assume that these three epistles were written during the same imprisonment of the apostle as Philippians. On the contrary, the differences between the two groups of letters suggest different occasions.³

II

First, the background of Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians needs to be discussed. (The conclusion that only Caesarea fits the references in question may be mentioned at the start.)

Since the beginning of the present century, a number of authors have held the view that Ephesus was the place of origin for the prison epistles, even though the New Testament contains not the slightest reference to any such imprisonment for Paul. Paul mentions repeated arrests (2 Cor. 6:5; 11:23; Rom. 16:7), but he does not locate any of these in Ephesus. Luke gives the exact opposite impression: he tells how (ca. A.D. 56) the uproar of the silversmiths (Acts 19:23-34) was stopped by the officials (19:35-40; 21:1). Paul recalls the same dreadful encounter in 1 Corinthians 15:32 ἐθηριομάχησα to be understood figuratively; a real fight with

[p.279]

animals would have left other traces in the literature). The hypothetical imprisonment in Ephesus is conceivable as the occasion for the "Epistle to the Ephesians" only on the basis of the assumption that the epistle was a circular letter (since "in Ephesus" is omitted from some manuscripts); but the strong reading includes the words "in Ephesus". In the case of Philemon and Colossians, as well as Philippians, the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment is saddled with contradictions to the narrative of Acts. These three letters refer to Timothy as co-sender (Phm. 1; Col. 1:1; Phil. 1:1); however, shortly prior to the riot in Ephesus, Timothy was to have gone to Macedonia (Acts 19:22). Mark and Luke are near the imprisoned Paul (Phm. 24; Col. 4:10, 14); yet Mark had not accompanied Paul to Asia Minor; and Luke, insofar as the "we"—references of Acts say anything about him, makes no mention of the arrest in Ephesus

² See Kümmel (page 277, n. 1) for the literature, pp. 229-41, 409 [= ET, pp. 226-37, 389].

³ The commentary which is still the most useful for introductory matters is J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (London, 1868; many editions; most recently reprinted: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963).

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

and was not there at that time. Thus the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment can neither be substantiated by any New Testament references, nor can it be brought into harmony with such.

On the other hand, the imprisonment of Paul in *Caesarea* at about A.D. 58-60 (Acts 23:33-26:32) fits quite well as background for the prison epistles addressed to Asia Minor.

As far as chronology is concerned, what Paul tells Philemon in Colossae about his situation (Phm. 9b) is extremely important: "I, Paul, [appeal to you] by the fact that I am such an old man, and now also a prisoner for Christ Jesus." According to the context (v. 8) Paul believes that he could claim his authority as an apostle. But he appeals rather to the sympathy of Philemon (ἀγάπη, 7: 9a) and simply presents the following petition on behalf of Onesimus as an older man (πρεσβύτης, one who is over fifty years of age), and as a prisoner. There is no doubt that the wording "now also a prisoner" indicates that Paul has been arrested only shortly before, and that he considers his imprisonment to be a new situation and an honour. This fits only an imprisonment in Jerusalem and Caesarea (ca. A.D. 58-60). Therefore, in the case of Philemon an ideal possibility of dating and locating the origin of the letter has been suggested: Paul wrote the epistle most probably at ca. A.D. 59 in Caesarea.

In the case of Colossians and Ephesians, many experts are again concerned with the question of authenticity; it is doubted whether the theology and ecclesiology of these epistles make such an early date possible. However, one should also be critical enough to see the questionable nature of all systematized explanations concerning the stages of doctrinal development. In the religious world development does not run in one continuous line, but the thoughts flow rather differently according to the nature of the soil. On the personal and topographical level, Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians demonstrate such complete agreement that they appear either to have originated in the same connexion or are the work of an editor who surreptitiously attempts to give the impression that they were written at the

[p.280]

same time. In the latter case it would be useful to know how it occurred to later forgers to make use of some of the older names and dates contained in the brief letter to Philemon in order to legitimize Colossians or Ephesians, even when it must have been obvious to such forgers that the introduction of current problems and circumstances would have been more profitable than the search for such antiquities. This much is clear: the statements in Colossians and Ephesians agree with those of Philemon and indicate an origin at the same time, *viz.* A.D. 59 in Caesarea. Either rigid conceptions concerning the development of theology must be modified, or the present correspondence of personalia in the three letters have been deliberate.

On the geographical side, the simplest picture of the trips which are mentioned or presupposed is gained by assuming that the three epistles originated in Caesarea. Paul is accompanied by several Hellenistic Christians (Phm. 23 f.; Col. 1:7; 4:7-14). According to Luke, such Hellenistic Jewish and Greek followers were present at Paul's return from the collection journey prior to Pentecost in A.D. 58 (Acts 20:16) and were the occasion (unjustly, according to Luke) for the tumultuous attack on Paul in Jerusalem (20:4; 16:28 f.; 24:19). Three persons who are mentioned in these epistles have a part in the account of this journey in Acts: Tychicus, Aristarchus, and Luke (the latter is included on the assumption that the "we"— passages include him [Acts 20:5, etc.]). It is possible that Tychicus, as well as his

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

fellow countryman Trophimus, followed Paul to Jerusalem (Acts 21:29) and then also to Caesarea; however, he is no longer listed among the companions of Paul on his trip to Rome. The assumption that Tychicus, starting out on his trip from Caesarea, was to deliver the three letters to Asia (two to Colossae, one to Ephesus) leads to an uncomplicated and satisfying picture of the circumstances behind the sending of the letters. Moreover, Aristarchus conveys a greeting (Phm. 24) as a fellow prisoner of Paul (Col. 4:10) and as such takes part in the journey to Rome (Acts 27:2). Luke gives a similar greeting (Phm. 24; Col. 4:14) and the "we"-passages seem to indicate that he took part in the trip to Rome as well. It is possible to interpret these greetings from Aristarchus and Luke as coming either from Caesarea or from Rome; however, the numerous other names in the table of greetings encourages one to favour Caesarea as the place of origin, and it seems improbable that so many disciples of Paul shared his voyage by ship to Rome.

Epaphras (Phm. 23), who had recently arrived from Colossae (Col. 1:7 f; 4:12), is among the other of Paul's fellow prisoners who send greetings. One can easily imagine him among the other Hellenistic companions of the apostle (some of whom were arrested in Palestine). Against the suggestion of his participation in Paul's trip to Rome is the fact that there is no evidence to suggest this; in addition, an arrest in Rome would not fit the description which Acts gives concerning the mild treatment which

[p.281]

Paul received there. Furthermore, the geographical circumstances allow for the assumption that the runaway slave, Onesimus of Colossae, had come to Palestine on foot, had asked for Paul's protection in Caesarea, and was sent back to Colossae with Tychicus (Phm. 12; Col. 4:7-9), again on foot. It is more difficult to imagine that this young slave journeyed to Rome by sea and then back again. In addition to providing a simpler explanation of the geographical data, the presence of the group of Hellenistic Christians, to whom attention has already been drawn, with Paul on his trip to Palestine following his third missionary journey may have prepared the way psychologically for Onesimus to confide in Paul.

It was especially during his imprisonment in Caesarea that Paul could have expected that he would be sent across Asia on his way to Rome, and thus he would be able to visit Colossae (Phm. 2). He might then go from Ephesus to Italy and eventually, having been acquitted, reach Spain (Rom. 15:3 f., 28). If, on the other hand, he wrote the three epistles in Rome, then the plans for a trip to Spain have to be dismissed as having been no more than a passing thought. However, in Rome, Paul would not have set his eyes on little Colossae as the goal for a trip following the journey to Spain.

Politically oriented concepts in Ephesians suggest that Caesarea fits best as the background for this letter (whether it was written by Paul or by a disciple). While in Jerusalem in A.D. 58, Paul himself experienced the animosity which the majority of the people there had for Greeks. The occasion was the claim that he had brought Greeks into the sanctuary (Acts 21:28 f.).⁴ On the wall between the court of the Gentiles and the court of the women, where the so-called Holy Place started,⁵ there were inscriptions containing restrictions which encouraged the

⁴ Concerning the gates of the temple, cf. E. Stauffer, "Das Tor des Nikanor", *ZNTW* 44 (1952/53), pp. 44-66.

⁵ The inner courts made up the "sanctuary" in the narrow sense of the word (τὸ ἱερόν; Acts 21:28; Josephus, *Ant.* XV. 419). Therefore, Luke's expression is not wrong (so H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1963), pp. 30 f., 123).

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

division of mankind into Gentiles and Jews. A transgression of this line of demarcation by the uncircumcized meant the death penalty for the transgressor (Josephus, *Bell.* V.193 f.; *Ant.* XV. 417). Fragments of these inscriptions are today located in Istanbul and Jerusalem.⁶

Paul was taken in protective custody to Caesarea, to keep him safe from the Zealots and their hatred of foreigners. There the oral accusations

[p.282]

of the Sanhedrin were brought forward (Acts 24:1-9). According to Josephus, at this particular time the animosity between Jews and Gentiles was even worse in Caesarea than in Jerusalem. Greeks (according to Josephus, they were Syrians) and Jews threw stones at one another. Each party denied the other the right of citizenship (ἰσοπολιτεία). The street battles spread even to Jerusalem after a new high priest by the name of Ishmael ben Phabi had come to power (in A.D. 59). The two parties in Caesarea appealed to the emperor; and, as one would expect, Burrus and Nero (in A.D. 59) declared the Greeks to be lawful citizens in Caesarea (Josephus, *Ant.* XX. 173-84). Similar riots in the year 66 in Caesarea ignited the Jewish War (Josephus, *Bell.* I. 284-92). During his imprisonment in Caesarea (A.D. 58-60) Paul would have had special reason to think about (a) the dividing wall in Jerusalem, (b) the animosity between Jews and Greeks, and (c) the disputation concerning the right of citizenship. It is no accident, therefore, that these topics of political concern influence the theological language of Ephesians: Paul speaks of (a) the ethnic dividing wall (Eph. 2:14 b), which has been removed in Christ, and the new temple (2:20); (b) the animosity between Jews and Gentiles (2: 14 c, 16 b; cf. Col. 1:21), which has been changed into peace through Christ (2:15 b, 17); (c) the divine citizenship (2:19), which in Christ belongs also to the Gentiles (3:6), as well as the fact that every nationality (πατριὰ) on earth has its origin in God the Father (3:15; cf. Col. 3:11). These politically oriented terms in Ephesians fit the situation of Paul in Caesarea so exactly that this city alone is suitable as a background for the epistle. This would be true regardless of whether the epistle was written by Paul or by one of his co-workers. (If the epistle is a forgery, then the author had unusually accurate information to hand.) The reason that such political images are found useful in the case of Ephesians, but not so much in the case of Colossians, is due to the situation of the readers in Asia: in Ephesus, municipal citizenship had been granted to the Jews,⁷ while in Colossae this privilege was not of immediate interest.

III

Other factors need to be considered in the attempt to locate the Pauline imprisonment lying behind the Philippian letter (cf. the reference to "chains", Phil. 1:7, 13, 14, 17).

⁶ C. Clermont-Ganneau, "Une stèle du temple de Jerusalem", *Revue archéologique*, nouv. ser. 23 (1872), pp. 214 ff.; VT. Dittenberger, *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae* 2 (1905), Nr. 598; Strack-Billerbeck 11 (1924), pp. 761 f.; J. H. Iliffe, "The *Thanatos* Inscription from Herod's Temple. Fragment of a Second Copy", *The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 6 (1936), pp. 1-3; I. I. E. Hondius, *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum* 8, 1 (1937), Nr. 169; E. J. Bickermann, "The Warning Inscriptions of Herod's Temple", *JQR* 37 (1947), pp. 387 ff.; B. Reicke, "Hednigamas begransade till Herodes' tempel", *Svenska Jerusalem-föreningens tidskrift* 46 (1947), pp. 116-24; J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past* (Princeton, 1959), fig. 118 (following p. 282), also pp. 325-26; J. Frey, *Corpus inscriptionum judaicarum* 2 (1952), Nr. 1400.

⁷ B. Reicke, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Berlin, 1964), p. 212 [= ET, *The New Testament Era* (Philadelphia, 1968), p. 287].

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

The specific references in the epistle point towards Rome and thus to the years ca. A.D. 60-62 (Acts 28:16, 30), as it was generally assumed by the older criticism. It will be made clear by what follows that the attempts to locate the place of origin of this epistle in other places rest on unwarranted conclusions and partly on historical misinterpretations.

[p.283]

The total lack of evidence for a Pauline imprisonment in Ephesus speaks against this theory (cf. above). Some have interpreted the expression, "praetorium" (Phil. 1:13) as referring to the residence of the governor (as in the gospels). Paul states that his imprisonment is now common knowledge "to the entire praetorium and all the others". Here he thinks of a body of people and other individuals, not an official residence. At any rate, the word was not used for the personnel of a governor either in Greek or in Latin;⁸ it is also noteworthy that the governor of Ephesus was not a *propraetor*, but rather a *proconsul*. Thus the use of the word "praetorium" in Philippians for a group of persons can only mean the imperial bodyguard which is designated by this loan-word from Latin in several Greek inscriptions (cf., among others, L. Huezey and H. Daumet, *Mission archéologique* [1876], Nr. 130-131; *Inscriptiones graecae* 14 [1890], Nr. 911; W. Dittenberger, *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones* 2 [1905], Nr. 707); the term in Latin was the normal expression for the well-known guard (Pliny, *Hist.* XXV, 6:17; Suetonius, *Net.* IX:2; Tacitus, *Hist.* 1:20, etc.).

Tiberius had placed this elite guard near the Porta Nomentana in Rome. During the first Christian centuries these praetorian cohorts remained stationed in the metropolis, although at times sections of the guard accompanied the emperor into the field of action. Inscriptions found in other areas (as the ones already mentioned) deal only with some veterans who previously had been praetorians. Representatives of the Ephesus theory believe, erroneously, that a few inscriptions found near a road close to Ephesus suggest that a local detachment of the imperial body was located there (CIL, 6085, 7135, and 7136). In fact, however, these inscriptions deal with a retired praetorian who after his service with the guard was assigned the position of gendarme (*stationarius*) on that highway. One can hardly create an entire force out of one policeman! The active praetorians had the responsibility of protecting the emperor and the capital city; the deployment of the group throughout the provinces during Paul's time would have been impossible militarily. Besides this, Asia was a senatorial province and was therefore ruled by civil authority; for this reason, no troops were stationed there.

The conclusion that the praetorium is to be understood as a body of persons also rules out Caesarea as the place of origin of Philippians. Auxiliary troops under the supervision of the procurator were stationed here, but none of the élite soldiers of the praetorium. Since the details of Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians which have been discussed earlier in the present essay point to Caesarea, the very different statements of Philippians appear to suggest another locality. Only Rome, therefore, is entirely suitable as the location for the writing of Philippians.

[p.284]

⁸ G. S. Duncan, *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry* (London, 1929), p. 109: *Praetorium* "must be taken not of the place as a building but of the people who are associated with it". The negative remark is correct, but the positive conclusion does not fit the lexical finding.

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

As far as matters of chronology are concerned, it is to be observed that Paul no longer refers to his imprisonment as a new condition (as in Phm. 9). He no longer speaks emphatically concerning his sufferings as a prisoner in chains (Phm. 1, 9 f., 13; Col. 1:24; 4:18; Eph. 3:1, 13; 4:1; 6:20), but only makes vague references to "chains" (Phil. 1:7, 13 f., 17) in the sense of a limitation of his freedom. Furthermore, Paul no longer speaks of fellow prisoners (cf. Phm. 23; Col. 4:10), but only of fellow workers whom he is able to meet and send out at will (Phil. 2:19, 25, 28; 4:18). He is able to thank the recipients for sending a contribution for his support (2:25, 30; 4:10-18). This fits Paul's situation in Rome exactly. Here he was permitted to live in a rented room under the surveillance of a guard (Acts 28:16, 23, 30). In Philippians the apostle speaks of his legal standing (τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, Col. 4:7; Eph. 6:21; Phil. 1:12) in an entirely new way: his defence of the gospel (Phil. 1:7, 16) has been effective (1:12), and he hopes that the legal procedures will soon be over (1:19-26; 2:24).

In terms of geography, the distance between Rome and Philippi causes no difficulty, even though some scholars consider it a problem because of the number of trips which are presupposed by the letter. Granted, the distance is about twice as long as the one between Ephesus and Philippi; but it is not as far as the one from Caesarea to the recipients. Moreover, the epistle presupposes only two journeys: (1) Epaphroditus has come from Philippi with a contribution for Paul (Phil. 4:18); and (2) a companion has reported to the people in Philippi concerning an illness which befell their envoy (Phil. 2:26, 30). Paul did not have to wait for confirmation of their having received this news, but rather counted on the speedy circulation of such news by faithful brethren. Neither did he wait for the return of Epaphroditus to Philippi before he wrote the epistle, but, rather, he had Epaphroditus take the completed letter along with him (2:25). Only a few months would be needed for Epaphroditus to make the journey, with the contribution from Philippi, to Rome and for Paul to send information to the Philippians by a companion. Good connections between Philippi and Rome existed in the Via Egnatia and the Via Appia. If the weather was not wholly unfavourable, a ship could make the passage from Greece to Italy in about a week (Pliny, *Hist.* XIX. 19:3 f. speaks of the stretch between Puteoli and Corinth as a record of five days and thereby gives us a picture of the possibilities).⁹ Since Paul lived for two whole years in his rented room in Rome (Acts 28:30), there was ample time for the trips referred to in Philippians. The trip to Spain (Rom. 15:24, 28), which has been mentioned previously, is not in contradiction to his intended visit to Philippi (Phil. 1:26), if one locates the Epistle to the Philippians in Rome, since in the capital it would have been possible for Paul to think of a journey to the West and then hope for a new visit to the East, where Philippi was an important centre.

[p.285]

It is of primary political importance that Philippi was a Roman colony settled by veterans (Acts 16:13). For those who had full privileges of citizenship in Philippi, military hierarchy and Roman citizenship were fundamental concepts of life. For this reason, it would also have been of interest to Paul to refer to the praetorium in the sense of the imperial bodyguard (Phil. 1:13). In Philippi, his readers knew Roman veterans, and the Roman praetorium was to them very well-known. This fact bolsters the apostle's report that practically the entire guard and others have come to realize that his imprisonment is the result of his proclamation of the gospel. Of course, Paul did not make a careful investigation in order to determine whether or not all the praetorians knew him; but he had the impression that in the barracks they spoke of him in a generally positive way.

⁹ E. Hilgert, "Schiffahrt", *BHH* 3 (1966), col. 1696.

Bo Reicke, "Caesarea, Rome, and the Captivity Epistles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.277-286.

A politically accused prisoner like Paul was guarded by a soldier (Acts 28:16) who was of the barracks of the praetorians. Josephus verifies this in his account of the arrest of Agrippa in Rome (*Ant.* XVIII.186-204). Of the two prefects of the bodyguard, one of them was responsible for the guarding of this kind of prisoner. During the Roman imprisonment of Paul and up to the year A.D. 62, the clever politician, Burrus, alone held this honour. Tacitus reports incidents at which Burrus used his guards as policemen, at times in opposition to Nero's cruel intentions (Tacitus, *Ann.* XIII. 48; XIV. 7-10; etc.). A prisoner who was accused of a foreign teaching could, occasionally, arouse the sympathy of the praetorian prefect. This, in fact, did occur between the oriental philosopher, Apollonius of Tyana, and the prefect, Aelianus (Philostratus, *Life of Apoll.* VII. 16-28). Although the account is highly imaginative, the dialogue between the philosopher and the prefect can clarify how the apostle was led to his optimistic report concerning the entire praetorium. Because of his discussions with the praetorians, he was convinced that the religious reason for his accusation was now known by the entire bodyguard.¹⁰

The Roman capital also provides the background for those images used by Paul in Philippians which refer to the political realm. This is true in the case of the exhortation to a worthy evangelical behaviour as a citizen (πολιτεύεσθε, Phil. 1:27), as well as of the reference concerning the true, heavenly commonwealth (πολίτευμα, 3:20).

It was impossible for the readers to misunderstand the reference to Rome and Nero's clients in the greeting from "those of Caesar's household" (Phil. 4:22). Clients and servants of the emperor lived in several places, but primarily in Rome. Here there also existed a Jewish synagogue of the Augustenses, the imperial freedmen (J. Frey, *Corpus inscriptionum judaicarum* 1 [Rome, 1936], p. LXXIII f.); and it was here also that Poppaea, in the year 62, protected the interests of the Jewish community (Josephus, *Ant.* XX.195; *Vit.* 16). It is not surprising that the Christian proclamation

[p.286]

found at that time a hearing in the imperial court or with the imperial clients. Paul is happy to be able to extend greetings from clients of the imperial house to the readers in Philippi. This fine point is lost if one does not accept Rome as the place where Paul had such success in important circles (Phil. 1:12) and from where he writes to encourage the Philippian Christians to share in his joy (2:18, etc.).

© 1970 The Paternoster Press. Reproduced by kind permission of the publisher.

Converted to PDF by Robert I Bradshaw in May 2005.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>

¹⁰ Concerning the bodyguard, similarly F. F. Bruce, "Praetorium", *BHH* 3 (1966), col. 1482.